

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of any changes to the claims and the remarks herein. Please contact the undersigned to conduct a telephone interview in accordance with MPEP 713.01 to resolve any remaining requirements and/or issues prior to sending another Office Action. Relevant portions of MPEP 713.01 are included on the signature page of this amendment. The Examiner states at page 2 of the Office Action that claims 29-88 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated 10-20-2004, the Examiner indicated claims 29-90 were pending. Claims 89 and 90 depend from claim 88. Thus claims 88 and 90 should be pending. In a telephone discussion with the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that claims 89 and 90 are pending and if there is another Office Action in response to this paper, it will not be final.

Claims 29-48, 50-59 and 88 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Applicants have corrected typographical errors in these claims to correct the antecedent basis issue raised by the Examiner and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view thereof.

Claims 29, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39 and 54 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bright and claims 29, 32-35, 37-39, 45, 50, 53-54, 56, 59 and 88 as being anticipated by Zifcak.

There are no prior art rejections to claims 30, 31, 36, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, 55, 89 and 90. Thus, since the 35 USC 112 rejections have been corrected, these claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

### **A**

Claim 36 which, as amended, should be allowable recites, "at least one of the flexible contact elements includes a protuberance at an end thereof." This limitation is not taught by the cited references. Independent claim 29, 33, 34 and 37 have been amended to include the same recitation. Thus, independent claims 29, 33, 34 and 37

(and all claims which depend directly or indirectly therefrom, e.g., 30, 32, 35, 38, 40, 41, 44, 50-56 and 88) should be allowable for the same reason that claim 36 is allowable.

**B**

In view of the amendment to the independent claims to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, claim 30 should be allowable and claim 31 which depends from claim 30 should be allowable. Multiply dependent claim 30 has been written as the following independent claims which should be allowable.

Original Claims	New Claims that should be allowable
29 + 30	103
33 + 30	104
34 + 30	105
37 + 30	106

Claim 107 which corresponds to allowable claim 31, which depends from claims 103-105 or 106 should be allowable.

Claim 108 which corresponds to claim 53 which depends from allowable claims 103 to 105 or 106 should be allowable.

**C**

In view of the amendment to the independent claims to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, claim 40 should be allowable. Multiply dependent claim 40 has been written as the following independent claims which should be allowable.

Original Claims	New Claims that should be allowable
29 + 40	109
33 + 40	110
34 + 40	111
37 + 40	112

Claim 113 which corresponds to allowable claim 51, which depends from claims 109-111 or 112, should be allowable.

**D**

In view of the amendment to the independent claims to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, claim 41 should be allowable. Multiply dependent claim 41 has been written as the following independent claims which should be allowable.

Original Claims	New Claims that should be allowable
29 + 41	114
33 + 41	115
34 + 41	116
37 + 41	117

Claim 118 which corresponds to allowable claim 53, which depends from claims 114-116 or 117 should be allowable.

**E**

In view of the amendment to the independent claims to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, claim 51 should be allowable. Multiply dependent claim 51 has been written as the following independent claims which should be allowable.

Original Claims	New Claims that should be allowable
29 + 51	119
33 + 51	120
34 + 51	121
37 + 51	122

Claim 123 which corresponds to allowable claim 53, which depends from claims 119-121 or 122, should be allowable.

**F**

In view of the amendment to the independent claims to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, claim 52 should be allowable. Multiply dependent claim 52 has been written as the following independent claims which should be allowable.

Original Claims	New Claims that should be allowable
29 + 52	124
33 + 52	125
34 + 52	126
37 + 52	127

Claim 128 which corresponds to claim 53, which depends from claims 124-126 or 127 should be allowable.

**G**

Support for added claims 91, 92 and 129 is the same as support for claim 36 and for example, in applicants Fig. 6 and Fig. 16 of incorporated by reference US Patent 5,371,654.

Support for added claims 93 to 98 and 130-135 is found in incorporated by reference patent US 5,371,654 Fig. 23 and Col. 11, lines 34-51 thereof and in claims 89 and 90.

In view of the changes to the claims and the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the above-identified application. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

If the above-identified Examiner's Action is a final Action, and if the above-identified application will be abandoned without further action by applicants, applicants file a Notice of Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences appealing the final rejection of the claims in the above-identified Examiner's Action. Please charge deposit account 09-0468 any fee necessary to enter such Notice of Appeal.

In the event that this amendment does not result in allowance of all such claims, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

MPEP 713.01 states in part as follows:

Where the response to a first complete action includes a request for an interview or a telephone consultation to be initiated by the examiner, ... the examiner, as soon as he or she has considered the effect of the response, should grant such request if it appears that the interview or consultation would result in expediting the case to a final action.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Daniel P Morris/  
Dr. Daniel P. Morris, Esq.  
Reg. No. 32,053  
Phone No. (914) 945-3217

IBM Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law Dept.  
P. O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598